least partially **along** a first side of the bag and which first and second ropes extend through the rigid tubular support in opposite directions.

The Mowbray reference utilizes only a single rope which passes through the tubular member not two ropes. Since there is only a single rope it cannot pass through the tubular member in opposite directions as specified by the present applicant's claims. Furthermore, the single rope passing through the tubular support in the Mowbray reference is not secured to one side of the bag as is required by the present applicant's claims for both the first and second ropes. Rather than having the ropes secured to the bags the Mowbray reference simply teaches running a single rope that is completely independent of the bags through the tubular support.

The advantages of the present applicant's invention over the prior art, typified by the Mowbray reference, is that by utilizing two ropes, each of which is secured to the side of the bag before passing through the tube, the rope makes two right turns. The first turn is where the rope comes up from the bag and enters the tube. The second right turn is where the rope exists the tube for securement to an overhead support. These two 90° angles create an opposing force that keeps the bag from slipping in either direction and makes it impossible for the bag to slip off the end of the tube. The 90° turns also cause sufficient friction to relieve pressure at the point where the rope is sewn to the bag resulting in structural integrity and longer life. It is pointed out to the examiner that insecticide dust bags of this nature are typically loaded with up to 25 pounds of insecticide, comparable to the weight two or three bowling balls. This causes considerable downward pressure, especially upon impact with a cow which may toss the bag upward with its head, causing the entire load to fall under the influence of gravity.

If the prior art bag of Cortner was combined with the solid support rod of Mowbray, there would still be only a single rope passing through the tubular support, there would not be two

ropes passing in opposite directions through the tubular support and the rope would still not be secured to the side of the bag. These are all limitations in applicant's claims. If the Cortner bag was supported on the Mowbray tube, there would be nothing to keep the bag from sliding back and forth, from bunching up at the center of the bag or from sliding off the ends of the tube.

In short, the prior art fails to teach the limitations of claims 1-9 which are directed to the very essence of the invention. In fact, the prior art not only fails to teach the invention, but teaches directly contrary to it. The prior art teaches utilizing one rope instead of two. The prior art teaches that the one rope passes through the tube in one direction rather than two ropes passing in opposite directions. The prior art teaches that the rope be unattached to the bag rather than having two ropes, each of which is secured to the side of the bag. There could hardly be greater evidence of non-obviousness than there is in this case where the prior art offers no suggestion of the claimed invention, does not even contemplate the problems which are addressed by the invention, and in fact teaches directly contrary to the distinguishing limitations of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is even further from any suggestion or teaching of applicant's invention than the patents discussed above.

It is clear that the applicant has presented claims which are distinguishable and non-obviousness over the prior art and accordingly, this application should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

J. David Wharton, Reg. No. 25,717
STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP
1201 Walnut, Suite 2800
Kansas City, MO 64106-2150
Telephone: (816) 842-8600
Facsimile: (816) 691-3495